UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

ANUCHA BROWNE SANDERS,

Plaintiff,

-against-

06 CV 0589 (GEL)

MADISON SQUARE GARDEN, L.P., ISIAH LORD THOMAS III and JAMES L. DOLAN,

Defendants.

VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF

New York, New York

Tuesday, January 23, 2007

REPORTED BY:

BARBARA R. ZELTMAN

JOB NO.: 11343





David Feldman

Worldwide

From File to Trial.

805 Third Avenue, 8th Floor New York, NY 10022 (800) 642-1099

600 Anton Boulevard, 11th Floor Costa Mesa, CA 92626 (866) DFW-1380

```
45
  1
  2
       at these entries?
  3
                   MR. MINTZER: Objection to
  4
            form.
  5
             Α
                   I don't recall.
  6
                   Did you discuss expenses with
             Q
  7
      Ms. Sanders?
  8
                   MR. MINTZER: Objection to
 9
            form.
10
                  Like I said, we had several
      conversations during probably the height
11
      of the season. Lot of this stuff is -- I
12
      don't remember. All I could tell you, I
13
      know we finished the return. That's all I
14
      know. Forgive me. We do a lot of
15
      clients, and that's information I don't
16
      recall. I really don't.
17
18
                  The page that follows, page
            Q
      now marked BH-56, is a continuation of
19
20
      Schedule C.
21
                  And Part 4 refers to
      information on your vehicle.
22
23
                  Did you discuss this
      information with Ms. Sanders?
24
25
                  MR. MINTZER: Objection to
```

		46
1		
2	form. Asked and answered.	
3	A I don't recall.	
4	Q And Part 5 with respect to	
5	Other Expenses, you also prepared this	
6	schedule; is that correct?	
7	A Yes.	
8	Q Did you discuss these items	
9	with Ms. Sanders?	
10	MR. MINTZER: Objection to	
11	form. Asked and answered.	
12	A Well, I don't recall. Like I	
13	said, we did the return at the height of	
14	the season. Information was spoken about.	·
15	I don't recall specifically what you are	
16	asking for.	
17	MS. FRANCO: Can we go off the	
18	record a moment?	
19	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going off	
20	record. Time is 10:40 a.m.	
21	(A brief recess was	
22	taken.)	
23	THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Going back	
24	on record. Time is 10:44 a.m.	
25	Q Mr. still referring	

		81
1		01
2	A Yes.	
,3	Q Do you recall when that	
4	conversation took place?	
5	A It would have been prior to	
6	the date see, in our system, when we	
7	print them out, it defaults to the date	
8	it's printed, which means this return	
9	could sit for a week or two before it	
10	actually gets reviewed. And then we speak	
11	to the client.	
12	And we don't have a log that	
13	says when printed, when called client,	
14	when case is closed. We don't have that	
15	kind of timeline. We don't maintain that	
16	kind of activity on an account.	
17	Q My question is merely	
18	A But what I'm saying to you,	
19	sir, is I would not know from this date	
20	when I called her. This could have been	
21	printed on the 29th. I could have	
22	spoken to her on April 1st, the 5th, the	
23	6th. I don't know.	
24	Q But your testimony is you did	
25	have a conversation with her regarding the	

	<i>u</i> :	
1		175
2	prepared in accordance with any	
3	requirements of the tax code; was it not?	
4	MR. MINTZER: Objection to	
5	form.	
6	A Yes.	
7	Q And that return was prepared	
8	in a manner that would not subject you to	
9	any criminal or civil sanctions under the	
10	tax code?	
11	MR. MINTZER: Objection to	İ
12	form.	i
13	Q Is that correct?	ļ
14	A Yes.	
15	Q With regard to that 2001	
16	return prepared in 2002, you never took	
17	any steps to engage with Anucha Browne	
18	Sanders in any fraud in that return, did	
19	you?	
20	MR. MINTZER: Objection to	
21	form.	
22	A No.	
23	Q And wouldn't it be fair to say	
24	that in the calendar year strike that.	
25	So again, with regard to the	
	3474 CO CHE	

1		176
2	2001 return that would have been prepared	
3	in 2002, you would not have included	
4	information on that return were it not	
5	information that you were led to believe	
6	was relevant to that return?	
7	MR. MINTZER: Objection to	
8	form.	
9	MR. GUNZBURG: Hold on a	
10	second. Could you just repeat the	
11	question.	
12	(Requested portion of record	
13	read.)	
14	MR. MINTZER: You have my	
15	objection.	
16	A We prepare returns based on	
17	information that our clients give to us.	
18	And so we had conversations with	
19	Ms. Browne Sanders, which were	
20	undocumented, and we would not sign the	
21	return if we felt the return was	
22	fraudulent.	
23	Q All right.	
24	And just let me be clear about	
25	your testimony. And that is that in the	
ì		

		177
1		±. / /
2	calendar year 2002 when you prepared the	
3	2001 return, that return would have been	
4	prepared based on information you received	
5	from Ms. Browne Sanders; is that correct?	
6	MR. MINTZER: Objection to	
7	form. Asked and answered.	
8	A Yes.	
9	Q Because it would be fair to	
10	say that in any tax year, you would not	
11	add information to a return if you did not	
12	have a basis for it received from the	
13	individual that you were doing the return	
1.4	for; is that correct?	
15	MR. GUNZBURG: Are you talking	
16	about generally, or talking about	
17	Anucha Browne Sanders?	
18	MS. FRANCO: I am talking	
19	about generally.	i
20	MR. MINTZER: Objection to	
21	form. Your questions are so leading,	
22	and really, you are testifying for	
23	this witness.	
24	MS. FRANCO: I consider him to	
25	be an adverse witness.	
		[

		203
1		
2	Q And have you ever made entries	
3	on Schedule C that were not either	
4	provided to you by the client orally or by	
5	documents?	
6	MR. MINTZER: Objection to	
7	form.	
8	A No.	
9	MR. MINTZER: Asked and	
10	answered.	
11	Q With regard to charitable	
12	deductions, is there a requirement under	
1.3	the tax code of supporting documentation	
14	for any charitable deductions sought over	
15	\$250?	
16	MR. GUNZBURG: At what point	
17	in time because the law changed?	
18	Q In the calendar year 2003 for	
19	the tax year 2002.	;
20	A I don't recall when that	
21	actually came into effect.	
22	Q But once that came into	
23	effect, the client would have understood	
24	from your communications that they would	
25	need supporting documentation if they were	